| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|---|--|---|
| | 09/891,888 | LACRAMPE ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Venkataraman Balasubramanian | 1624 |
| All Participants: | Status of Application: | |
| (1) <u>Venkataraman Balasubramanian</u> . | (3) | |
| (2) <u>Ralph Palo</u> . | (4) | |
| Date of Interview: <u>5 August 2004</u> | Time: | |
| Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applic Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description: . | cant's representative) | |
| Part I. | | |
| Rejection(s) discussed: Potential 112 second paragraph | | |
| Claims discussed: | | |
| Prior art documents discussed: None | | |
| Part II. | | |
| SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENI Potential 112 second parargraph rejection of claim 37 was disc examiner's amendment | | |
| Part III. | | |
| ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summand | he examiner will provide a ware record of the substance of | ritten summary of the substance the interview |
| | | · |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| (Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicar | nt/Applicant's Representative | Signature – if appropriate) |